



Welcome to the Water Quality Standards Academy's module on public involvement programs and practices. This module is intended to be a primer for including an effective public involvement process in the water quality standards program.

Purpose of the Presentation

This presentation serves as a guide for States and Tribes to:

- Encourage effective use of public involvement in water quality standards (WQS) decision-making
- Design a planning process for involving the public
- Explore additional resources and tools that may be useful



This training provides an overview of considerations for involving the public in water quality standards decision-making. States and Tribes are encouraged, and in particular instances required, to involve the public. This presentation outlines the requirements of public involvement and highlights good practices for creating an effective process. Links to EPA policy, resources, and tools are provided throughout and compiled at the end of the presentation for further development of a tailored public involvement process.

What's Covered in the Module

- Clean Water Act (CWA) Requirements: Statutory & Regulatory
- Value of Encouraging Public Involvement
- Elements of EPA's 7-Step Public Involvement Policy
- Public Participation Example
- Sources of Additional Information
- Quick-and-Easy Quiz



The first part of this presentation covers the public involvement requirements as laid out in the Clean Water Act Statute and Regulations. It may be helpful at times to refer to the sections in the statute at Section 303 and in the regulations at Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 25 and 131.

The second part of the presentation covers the value of an effective public participation process. Then in the third part, EPA's seven steps to involving the public in policymaking are explained.

The presentation wraps up with a case example and links to additional resources. Then at the very end is a brief quiz to test your retention of some of the key points.

Section 1. WQS Requirements on Public Involvement under the CWA

4

This is the first—and the longest—of the four main sections of the presentation. It covers regulatory requirements. So, it can be a little dry. But it's important information because it reviews what's mandatory and what's encouraged under EPA regulations on involving the public in a State or Tribe's water quality standards development process. And it highlights what's meant by "the public." In addition, this section touches on requirements other than those promulgated by EPA that you should be aware of. All this provides the context for considering the advantages of public involvement and recommended approaches for doing it effectively.

CWA Requirements: Statutory

The Basis for WQS Regulations on Public Involvement

Clean Water Act Section 303(c)(1) defines when public involvement in the WQS program is mandatory:

- State or Tribe shall hold one public hearing at least every three years for
 - Reviewing New Standards
 - Revising or Modifying Standards

■? If links or attachments from this presentation fail to launch, add the presentation url to the allowed web addresses in your pop-up blocker settings.

For more, see Section 303 of the Clean Water Act at <http://water.epa.gov/lawsregs/guidance/303.cfm>



5

The regulatory requirements pertaining to the water quality standards program are derived from the Clean Water Act.

Section 303(c)(1) requires that a State hold at least one public hearing every three years to review new water quality standards and, as appropriate, to modify and adopt standards.

CWA Requirements: Regulatory

Relevant Sections of the Regulations

Public Involvement is discussed in the following sections of the Code of Federal Regulations:

- 40 CFR 131.20(b): Review and Revisions of WQS
- 40 CFR 25: Public Participation Regulation
- 40 CFR 131.10(e): Designation of Uses
- 40 CFR 131.12(a): Antidegradation Policy

You can find the Code of Federal Regulations at

<http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov>

■? If links or attachments from this presentation fail to launch, add the presentation url to the allowed web addresses in your pop-up blocker settings.

6

The regulations developed by EPA to implement the Clean Water Act specify how public participation shall be conducted. Public involvement in the water quality standards program is discussed in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations at parts 131.20(b), part 25, part 131.10(e), and part 131.12(a).

These sections of the regulation are discussed over the next several slides.

CWA Requirements: Regulatory

Public Involvement in WQS Reviews

40 CFR 131.20(b) “Review and Revisions” of WQS calls for:

- Public hearing when reviewing WQS
- Public participation process to follow regulations set forth in:
 - State law
 - 40 CFR 25
- Proposed revisions and supporting information publically available prior to hearing



The regulation at 131.20(b) stipulates that “the State shall hold a public hearing for the purpose of reviewing water quality standards, in accordance with provisions of State law and public participation regulation (40 CFR part 25).” It also states that “the proposed water quality standards revision and supporting analyses shall be made available to the public prior to the hearing.”

CWA Requirements: Regulatory

**General Requirements for
Public Involvement**

40 CFR 25 “Public Participation” Regulation:

- Sets forth minimum requirements for public participation activities
- Suggests program elements for enhanced participation
- Encourages the participation of the public, where public is defined as all interested and affected segments of the population

See also EPA’s Public Involvement Website at
<http://www.epa.gov/publicinvolvement>

8

States and Tribes shall meet the requirements of 40 CFR Part 25 (Public Participation in Programs under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act; The Safe Drinking Water Act , and the Clean Water Act). Part 25 sets forth some minimum requirements for holding a public hearing or meeting, suggests program elements for effective participation, and encourages broad participation from both interested and affected segments of the population.

CWA Requirements: Regulatory

The “Public” Further Defined

40 CFR 25.3 “Policy and Objectives” defines the “public” in the broadest sense as the whole public, including those persons:

- Affected directly or indirectly by a decision
- Having some other concern about the decision



9

Subsection 25.3(a) of 40 CFR 25 states that “‘the public’ in the broadest sense, means the people as a whole, the general populace.” The regulation then points out that there can be identifiable “segments of the public” that may have a particular interest in a given program or decision, adding “interested and affected segments of the public may be directly or indirectly impacted by a decision, or they may have some other concern about the decision.”

The regulation also notes that, “in addition to private citizens, the public may include, representatives of consumer, environmental, and minority associations; trade, industrial, agricultural and labor organizations; public health, scientific, and professional societies; civic associations; public officials; and governmental and educational associations.”

CWA Requirements: Regulatory

Involvement in Formal Hearings and Informal Meetings

40 CFR 25.5 & 25.6 “Public Hearings” and “Public Meetings” outline the requirements for each activity:

- Provide notice 45 days prior to public hearing or meeting
- Make relevant documents available for at least 30 days
- Hold activity at locations and times that facilitate public attendance
- Prepare transcript, recording, or other complete record of a public hearing

10

Subsections 25.5 and 25.6 include the requirements for holding formal hearings and informal meetings. Well-publicized advance notification of an activity is required 45 days prior to public hearings and public meetings, although in particular circumstances notice may be reduced to not less than 30 days. In addition, background information and technical summaries must be made available to the public at least 30 days prior to the date for both activity types. Further, to the maximum extent feasible, hearings and meetings are to be held at locations and times that encourage participation from all segments of the population. Then transcripts or audio recordings should be provided—while these are required for public hearings, they are not required for meetings.

CWA Requirements: Regulatory

Summarizing/Responding to Public Input

40 CFR 25.8 “Responsiveness Summaries” outlines the components of a response to public participation activity:

- Prepare responsiveness summaries at specific decision points as specified in program regulations
- Responsiveness Summaries must include
 - Description of activity and issues discussed
 - Summary of the public’s views, significant comments, criticisms, and suggestions
 - Agency response to public’s suggestions and concerns
- Summaries are to be provided to the appropriate decision-maker and be made available to the public

11

Subsection 25.8 covers the response to comment requirements. “Responsiveness summaries” are the State or Tribe’s response to the public’s verbal and written comments. Responses are to be prepared following participation activities and at certain milestones, such as with interim and final decisions. In particular, the State or Tribe should demonstrate in the response and decision that it has understood and fully considered public concerns. For this reason, a responsiveness summary should include a description of the decision, a summary of the public’s views, and an explanation of the action taken. The public must then be given access to the response.

CWA Requirements: Regulatory

Involvement in Other Aspects of a WQS Program

Public participation is also required at

- 40 CFR 131.10(e) "Designation of Uses": Prior to adding or removing a use or establishing sub-categories of a use
- 40 CFR 131.12(a)(2) "Antidegradation Policy": When allowing a lowering of water quality on a Tier 2 (high quality) water



12

In addition to reviews of water quality standards, EPA requires that the opportunity for public participation be provided with two of the main components in water quality standards development.

Part 131.10(e) requires the public be involved when changing a designated use of a water body. Involvement in this activity can be particularly useful because information on existing and designated uses can be directly solicited from the public.

Part 131.12 (a)(2) in the Antidegradation Policy requires public participation and intergovernmental coordination when determining whether to allow a new activity or discharge that would lower water quality in a high quality water.

CWA Requirements: Regulatory
State/Tribal Requirements

States and Tribes may have requirements of their own that are more stringent than the Federal provisions.



13

In addition to Federal requirements, States and Tribes may have their own, more stringent public involvement policies, laws, and regulations.

CWA Requirements: Regulatory

Summary of the Requirements

Public Involvement is required when

- Reviewing new standards
- Modifying or adopting standards
- Performing a designated use change
- Conducting an antidegradation review



14

In summary, Federal regulations require a public hearing when reviewing new standards as part of a triennial—or three year—review or at any point when modifying or adopting standards. Proposing a designated use change to any water body requires solicitation of public input. Similarly, public input and intergovernmental coordination is required as part of an antidegradation review of high quality waters.

Additional Requirements

Addressing Environmental Justice

- Executive Order 12898 on environmental justice in Federal actions
 - Sets forth expectations of fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income
- States and Tribes may consider practices developed by EPA to identify and address areas with potential environmental justice issues

See also EPA Office of Environmental Justice Resources at
<http://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice/resources/index.html>

■? If links or attachments from this presentation fail to launch, add the presentation url to the allowed web addresses in your pop-up blocker settings.

15

Federal agencies are required to follow this Executive Order for Environmental Justice. A well-thought-out public involvement policy complements environmental justice efforts by promoting participation of the public to the fullest extent possible, regardless of race, culture, or income.

Further, States and Tribes are encouraged to develop a practice of conducting extensive outreach by using innovative methods to ensure that every community enjoys protection from environmental and health hazards with equal access to the decision-making process.

Section 2. The Value of Public Involvement in WQS Programs

16

In this brief but important section of the presentation, we consider the advantages of involving the public in State or Tribal water quality standards decision-making. The point is that public involvement is required because it strengthens the process, yielding better, more real-world standards for protecting the public's shared waterbody resources. That is, stakeholders and other members of the public often can provide key information that might not otherwise be readily available—for instance, about such considerations as waterbody use and economic impacts. And while enabling States and Tribes to make more informed decisions, soliciting public input also helps build support for standards implementation.

Value of Public Involvement

Identifying a Range of Viewpoints

- Fosters equal and open access to information
- Uncovers unique insights into community values, concerns, and practices
- Can recognize or pose a problem the State or Tribe may have missed



Identifying a range of viewpoints through increasing participation in environmental policy-making can strengthen the effectiveness of decisions. A broad range of perspectives will promote the sharing of ideas, data, and information. Also, new sources of unique community information can be accessed such as values, concerns, practices, local norms, and relevant histories. Importantly, narrative information of this type may be useful in identifying issues that were previously unknown to a State or Tribe.

The community may also be able to provide information—such as exposure data—not otherwise accessible to a government agency because of a lack of resources or other barriers. This is particularly true of site-specific decisions, such as designated use changes and antidegradation reviews. Further, enlisting the support of municipalities, industries, environmentalists, universities, other agencies, and the affected public may strengthen the scientific basis for decisions.

Early public involvement to gain information could ultimately save time and resources later in the process.

Value of Public Involvement

Assessing & Addressing Concerns

- Encourages early discussions and resolution of conflicts
- Solicits assistance in understanding potential consequences and identifying alternatives
- Increases the clarity and effectiveness of a WQS program



18

Engaging the public during the development of policies and regulations can lead to more effective and readily accepted decisions. Assessing and addressing concerns in early discussions allows for education of interested parties and resolution of conflicts. In general, an open and transparent discussion process brings about more implementable policies with less overall resistance.

Public involvement can be particularly beneficial for informing decisions at certain points in the water quality standards process. For example, members of an urban community may reveal that fish consumption from a polluted water body will not decrease solely with an information campaign. Rather, that a multi-pronged approach to risk management is needed.

By increasing the clarity and effectiveness of a water quality standards program, public participation in decision-making will promote compliance.

Value of Public Involvement

Building Support for Decisions and Programs

- Fosters mutual trust, confidence, and openness between regulators and the public
- Promotes involvement in the regulator's mission to protect human health and the environment

See also EPA's Better Decisions Manual at

<http://www.epa.gov/stakeholders/pdf/betterdecisions.pdf>

■? If links or attachments from this presentation fail to launch, add the presentation url to the allowed web addresses in your pop-up blocker settings.

19

Involving many segments of the public in the standards adoption process can help foster mutual trust and promote the regulator's mission to protect human health and the environment and encourage participation in carrying out its goals. For example, engaging and educating citizens in the water quality standards program may result in better community-based enforcement or watchdog efforts.

Section 3. Elements of EPA's 7-Step Public Involvement Policy

20

Because of the importance of public involvement in making decisions about the environment, EPA provides guidance through a policy statement on the topic that is relevant to States and Tribes when developing water quality standards. This section of the presentation reviews the policy's seven recommended steps for public involvement activities in the context of water quality standards development. The recommendations are based on the idea that good planning yields the best results and that any process can be improved by including a feedback loop for evaluating outcomes and making any necessary adjustments. With this in mind, this section considers each step in the context of the respective goals and methods used to accomplish them.

EPA's Public Involvement Policy **Recommended Steps**

EPA's 2003 General Public Involvement Policy outlines 7 recommended steps:

1. Plan and budget for public involvement activities.
2. Identify the interested and affected public.
3. Consider providing technical/financial assistance to facilitate involvement.
4. Provide information and outreach to the public.
5. Conduct public consultation and involvement activities.
6. Review and use public input and provide feedback to the public.
7. Evaluate public involvement activities.

See also EPA's Public Involvement Policy document at
<http://www.epa.gov/publicinvolvement/pdf/policy2003.pdf>

21

EPA's Public Involvement Policy outlines seven key steps to consider when planning, conducting, and evaluating a public involvement activity. This presentation addresses each step in the following slides, with material taken mostly from the Policy itself; however, some of the material has been modified to have more relevance to the water quality standards program. As noted on this slide, the full policy document is available online.

EPA's Public Involvement Policy

Step 1: Plan and Budget

- Goal: Facilitate an effective public involvement process through planning
- Methods:
 - Determine objectives and appropriate level of public involvement
 - Budget for personnel, materials, venue costs
 - Set a schedule consistent with the decision process

See also EPA's Superfund Community Involvement Toolkit
<http://www.epa.gov/superfund/community/toolkit.htm>

■? If links or attachments from this presentation fail to launch, add the presentation url to the allowed web addresses in your pop-up blocker settings.

22

There are a number of considerations when carrying out a successful public involvement process; therefore, detailed planning is essential. First consider your objectives as well as the appropriate level of public involvement needed to realize desired outcomes. For example, does the issue warrant information dissemination, interactive consultation, or more collaborative approaches?

When preparing budget and planning documents, consider the potential costs of the venue and equipment, outreach and communications, meeting facilitators, travel costs, expert consultants, and staff time dedicated to the public involvement process.

Schedule public involvement activities to track the decision-making process. And be sure to include adequate time to review the public's comments and evaluate the participation process.

EPA's Public Involvement Policy

Step 2: Identify the Interested and Affected Public

- Goal: Identify groups and members of the public who may have expressed interest in the proposed action or who by the nature of their location, purposes, or activities may be affected by it
- Methods:
 - Create a list of contacts in order to include a variety of individuals and organizations that reach as many parties as possible

23

For each new issue requiring public involvement, develop a contact list for members of the public interested and potentially affected by the proposed action. These lists can be constructed using various methods, including

--participating in workshops, community meetings, and public events to share information

--encouraging external organizations to publicize proposed activities

--including a point of contact on all outreach documents so individuals may ask to be placed on lists, and

--using comprehensive or creative means that consider the community structure, languages spoken, local communications preferences, and the locations where the community regularly congregates.

Use contact lists to announce involvement opportunities and the availability of information, and to identify other members of the public.

EPA's Public Involvement Policy

**Step 3: Provide Technical/
Financial Assistance**

- **Goals:**
 - Improve public involvement opportunities through providing technical or financial assistance to stakeholders and members of the public
 - Build capacity for the public to understand complex technical issues and to enable substantive participation
- **Methods:**
 - Identify situations where the public may not have the knowledge or resources to effectively participate
 - Provide access to technical personnel or expert staff members

24

Many of the actions undertaken in the water quality standards program can involve highly technical, complex issues. So, an understanding of the basic science is a requirement for effective public involvement. Therefore, it is important to identify situations where members of the affected public may not have the requisite knowledge or resources to meaningfully participate in the decision-making process. Keep in mind that States and Tribes can assist members of the public in several ways, including, but not limited to, providing access to technical consultants and knowledgeable staff members.

EPA's Public Involvement Policy

Step 4: Provide Information and Outreach

- Goals:
 - Provide the public with access to accurate, understandable, pertinent and timely information to facilitate effective involvement
- Methods:
 - Develop pertinent information and educational programs
 - Summarize complex technical issues in easily understood language
 - Use different types of materials for information communication
 - Provide information at easily accessible, central locations

25

As discussed in the previous step, a basic understanding of the science behind the issue is necessary to facilitate meaningful public involvement. Step four emphasizes the importance of providing accurate, understandable, pertinent, and timely information to the public. In addition, explaining current policy, the legal process of decision making, and the significance of the technical data is important in establishing the context for a proposed action. Then clearly identify the role of the public in the specific decision to be made.

Be creative in the types of communication materials used. Consider documents, fact sheets, news articles, workshops, hotlines, video conferences, field trips, and video presentations as educational aides. Consider the need for language translation. And ensure that all information is centrally located on the State or Tribe's website, at information repositories, or at a State or Tribe's field office.

EPA's Public Involvement Policy

Step 5: Conduct Public Involvement Activities

- Goals: Provide for the exchange of information and views and open exploration of issues, alternatives, and consequences between interested and affected members of the public and decision-makers
- Methods:
 - Use interactive methods that allow participants opportunities to discuss issues and provide input
 - Consider use of a third-party moderator



26

Conducting the public consultation activity is the key step in the participation process. The public meeting or hearing should provide for an open exploration of the issues, alternatives, and consequences between the participating parties.

In addition to the regulatory requirements cited at 40 CFR 25, Federal policy suggests using interactive methods to promote discussion of issues. While certain formalities apply to public meetings and hearings, procedures should not be so prescriptive as to discourage participation. When handling sensitive or controversial issues, or any decision with significant impact, consider hiring a third-party moderator.

EPA's Public Involvement Policy

Step 6: Review, Use, and Respond to Public Input

- Goals: Earn and retain the public's trust in the process by evaluating and assimilating public viewpoints and preferences into final decisions
- Methods:
 - Examine and analyze input in relation to scientific and other information
 - Clearly document consideration of public views in responsiveness summaries, preamble
 - Provide response to the public

27

Reviewing and integrating public input should occur in coordination with review of scientific and other relevant information. The State or Tribe must demonstrate in its decisions and actions that it has understood and fully considered public concerns.

It is important for States and Tribes to communicate how public input was used to make final decisions. This can be achieved by documenting and communicating to the public in a transparent way; for example, when writing responsiveness summaries and regulatory preambles.

EPA's Public Involvement Policy

Step 7: Evaluate Public Involvement Activities

- Goals: Evaluate the effectiveness of the public involvement process
- Methods:
 - Develop an internal debriefing process
 - Use surveys, interviews, focus groups to gauge effectiveness



28

States and Tribes can evaluate and measure, on a continuing basis, the effectiveness of their public involvement process and activities in order to improve future implementation. One approach is to develop an internal debriefing process, which may simply consist of a list of questions to discuss. Suggestions for topics include:

- did you achieve your process objectives?
- was the information gained useful in the decision-making?
- what would you do differently?
- how could your team improve your performance in the future?
- what do you think would have happened if you didn't use a collaborative process?

Also solicit feedback on the process from other participants through surveys, interviews, focus groups, and other tools to gauge effectiveness.

Section 4. Public Participation Example involving Community Fish Consumption Behavior

29

This final section of the presentation highlights one of many possible examples in which public involvement in an environmental analysis resulted in the identification of an important community-specific consideration.

This example demonstrates a participation process that was successful in assessing a community-specific risk to higher fish-consuming populations and revised the course of the water quality management decision.

Public Involvement Example:

Community Fish Consumption Behavior

Introduction

- Urban neighborhoods along a river are home to pollution-generating operations
- State considered changing the water quality goals of the river segment
- State took proactive approach and conducted early community outreach
- Public involvement identified need for additional information collection

30

A river runs through an urban industrial and residential neighborhood. The neighborhood is ethnically diverse and among a city's most polluted. A considerable amount of land is used for industry, including a sewage treatment plant, solid waste transfer station, and petroleum and natural gas storage facilities.

The State originally set a goal of improving water quality so that all aquatic life and recreational activities would be fully protected on this river. However, industry stakeholders contended that the permit limits for mercury are unfairly stringent due to an unreasonable water quality goal. These stakeholders urged the State to consider changing the designated use and associated criteria for the river. The State agreed to reevaluate the water quality goal through a use attainability analysis.

Residents in this neighborhood, partly because of the hazards they face from these industries, regularly organize and collaborate on environmental health issues. Thus, when the State began to gather information to conduct a use attainability analysis—a pre-requisite to changing a water quality goal—the State involved the community very early in the process.

When the State described its proposal to possibly change the water quality goals at the first community meetings, the public raised important community-specific considerations about fish consumption. In particular, meeting participants cautioned that many residents were eating—and essentially surviving on—fish caught in the river. The State was previously unaware of this activity and the potential route of mercury exposure.

Public Involvement Example:

Community Fish Consumption Behavior

Listening to Public Concerns and Gaining Valuable Input

- Neighborhood groups collected evidence of fishing use and estimated a fish consumption rate
- State collected mercury fish tissue data and estimated the health risk
- Collected data prompted the State to retain the designated use
- Community groups took targeted actions to address the subsistence fishers' risk

31

Community groups offered to assist the State with collecting information on the practices of local anglers. The State welcomed the participation. And then, working collaboratively, the team conducted over 200 interviews of neighborhood residents.

When compiled, the survey provided evidence that many residents were consuming and subsisting on fish caught from the river. Further, the interviews suggested that, on average, adult family members of an angler were eating 20 ounces of cooked fish per week. Using the consumption data and additional fish tissue data collected by the State, it was found that the exposure to mercury in adult subsistence anglers exceeded EPA's acceptable risk levels.

Because of the information provided in the surveys, the State proposed to stakeholders that there be no change to the water quality goals based on the presence of an existing fishing use. To address the industry's concerns, the State began investigating non-point sources of mercury and developed potential mercury pollutant minimization plans.

Residents were energized by the participation in the surveys and water quality analysis so much that they formed coalitions with other organizations to take targeted actions outside of the traditional regulatory response of fish advisories and fishing bans. The group held a waterfront festival where hazard information was distributed, launched a community garden, and rezoned the neighborhood to encourage new supermarkets and affordable housing.

Public Involvement Example:

Community Fish Consumption Behavior

Summary Points

- State engaged the community early in the process
- Residents described local practices, which led to more informed data collection
- State saved time and resources planned for the use attainability analysis
- The co-developed risk assessment led to residents' comprehensive action

32

The State engaged the community early in the process, but only took into account local cultural practices after the public raised them as a consideration.

Residents helped the State collect community-specific information on fish consumption practices that was not otherwise readily available.

Had the State been farther along in their analysis before consulting the public, this valuable information about local fishing practices would not have been communicated and agency resources and time would have been wasted. It was beneficial to the State to address residents' concerns by investigating the existing uses of the urban river early in the process.

The results of the risk assessment—supported by narratives collected in the community interviews—helped shape more comprehensive action for addressing potential exposure to toxins.

In summary, the State viewed public involvement as an opportunity to gather community knowledge, build support for programs, and address the effectiveness of planned actions.

Water Quality Standards Program

Sources of Additional Information

- Clean Water Act Section 303
<http://water.epa.gov/lawsregs/guidance/303.cfm>
- Code of Federal Regulations
<http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov>
- EPA's Public Involvement Website
<http://www.epa.gov/publicinvolvement>
- EPA's Public Involvement Policy
<http://www.epa.gov/publicinvolvement/pdf/policy2003.pdf>
- EPA's Better Decisions Manual
<http://www.epa.gov/stakeholders/pdf/betterdecisions.pdf>
- EPA's Office of Environmental Justice Resources
<http://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice/resources/index.html>
- EPA's Superfund Community Involvement Toolkit
<http://www.epa.gov/superfund/community/toolkit.htm>

Because this presentation includes voiceover narration, it is best experienced using audio speakers or headphones.



33

This slide lists sources of additional information relevant to the water quality standards program. The listing is a compilation of references that appear throughout the presentation. The websites listed provide materials that may be useful for promoting public involvement in water quality standards development. Although some of the materials may not directly apply to the water quality standards program—such as the Superfund community involvement toolkit—they serve to highlight practices not otherwise covered in this presentation.

Public Involvement Program and Practices

Quick-and-Easy Quiz

A few multiple-choice questions to see what you've learned.

Questions 1 and 2



The final portion of this presentation is a very brief, multiple-choice quiz to highlight a few key points about public involvement in water quality standards development.

We hope you've found this presentation useful. Feedback to the EPA Water Quality Standards Academy is always welcomed.

Question 1: What is the benefit of engaging the public/stakeholders in decisions on water quality standards?

- A. Gaining insights beyond what staff technical experts might provide.
- B. Building public support for the standards.
- C. Strengthen the scientific basis of decisions.
- D. All of the above.

Question 2: Statement (True or False): Along with establishing minimum requirements for public involvement in water quality standards development, the Clean Water Act also requires States and Tribes to involve the public in triennial reviews of the standards.

- A. True
- B. False

Public Involvement Program and Practices
Quick-and-Easy Quiz

Question 3



Question 3: Which of the recommended steps in EPA's policy on public involvement is particularly important for earning and retaining public trust?

- A. Planning and budgeting for public involvement activities.
- B. Providing technical assistance to facilitate public involvement.
- C. Providing feedback to the public on how input provided was assessed/used.

Public Involvement Program and Practices
Quick-and-Easy Quiz

Answers



Answers:

Question 1: What is the benefit of engaging the public/stakeholders in decisions on water quality standards?

Answer: D. All of the above.

Question 2: Statement (True or False): Along with establishing minimum requirements for public involvement in water quality standards development, the Clean Water Act also requires States and Tribes to involve the public in triennial reviews of the standards.

Answer: True. The regulation (40 CFR Subpart (C)131.20(b)) stipulates that “The State shall hold a public hearing for the purpose of reviewing water quality standards....” A review of the standards must be conducted at least once every three years.

Question 3: Which of the recommended steps in EPA’s policy on public involvement is particularly important for earning and retaining public trust?

Answer: C. Providing feedback to the public on how input provided was assessed/used. Feasible and appropriate techniques should be used to provide feedback on how the public’s input influenced development of the standards.